

Date: Wed, 21 Jul 93 17:30:42 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #245
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Wed, 21 Jul 93 Volume 93 : Issue 245

Today's Topics:

 ARRL policymaking
 Give a VE \$5.60, walk
 Policy of Reverse Autopatches, anything new? (3 msgs)
 PRB-1 and the ARRL (2 msgs)
 References for Code vs. No-Code Debate 82-90
 STILL waiting for your license? Read this and weep! (4 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 21 Jul 93 13:37:46
From: idacrd.ccr-p.ida.org!idacrd!n4hy@uunet.uu.net
Subject: ARRL policymaking
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

>How many Board members were elected between the time K1ZZ made this statement
>and the League ramed the no-code issue down its member's throats on
>August 21, 1989, when the ARRL filed their petition for codeless class of

No. You name just ONE that was voted OUT of office in the election that
FOLLOWED the ARRL board action. You cannot.

Bob

--

Robert W. McGwier | n4hy@ccr-p.ida.org
Center for Communications Research | Interests: amateur radio, astronomy, golf
Princeton, N.J. 08520 | Asst Scoutmaster Troop 5700, Hightstown

Date: 21 Jul 93 18:37:23 GMT
From: psinntp!arrl.org@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Give a VE \$5.60, walk
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In rec.radio.amateur.policy, dana@lando.la.locus.com (Dana H. Myers) writes:
[deleted]

>While it is true many people can learn CW, much like many people can
>learn to play the piano, Erich does have a valid point. It appears
>that people who do not know CW are viewed as lesser people by the
>morse fanatics. It is effectively a prejudice. It would seem that
>"morse fanatics" automatically assume that a person that doesn't
>know Morse code is lazy or wants something for free.
>
>*You* may not feel this way, but this is an attitude I've frequently
>seen among the people I regard as "morse fanatics". This attitude is
>not friendly, and effectively is the same as a racial or ethnic bigotry.

That attitude is by no means unique to Morse fanatics. I know people
who define "real" hams by:

- their DXCC country count, or
- whether they operate above 450 MHz, or
- whether they have homebrew equipment, or
- how much traffic they handle, or
- whether they can explain how CSMA/CD works, or
- their score in the most recent contest, or
- whether they use QRP, or
- yes, their Morse code ability, or
- ... what have you.

Those who hold such opinions may themselves be "real" hams, but
they aren't people I look up to or admire.

Ability to use Morse doesn't make you a ham. Ability to describe the
operation of a class-C amplifier doesn't make you a ham. What makes
you a ham is participation in the avocation of Amateur Radio, no matter
which part of it you pursue.

Jon Bloom, KE3Z | jbbloom@arrl.org
American Radio Relay League |
225 Main St., Newington CT 06111 |

Date: Wed, 21 Jul 1993 17:50:46 GMT
From: usenet.coe.montana.edu!netnews.nwnet.net!saturn.wwc.edu!saturn.wwc.edu!
morgdw@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: Policy of Reverse Autopatches, anything new?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Have been off the net for awhile, has any new policies been released on
reverse autopatches? Thanks.
Dwight

Date: 21 Jul 1993 17:16:06 -0400
From: digex.com!digex.net!not-for-mail@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Policy of Reverse Autopatches, anything new?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

morgdw@saturn.wwc.edu (DWIGHT CLINTON MORGAN) writes:
>Have been off the net for awhile, [have] any new policies been released on
>reverse autopatches? Thanks.

Nothing new.

You can make reverse autopatches today same as ever.

--

bote@access.digex.net (John Boteler)
WARNING: You are subject to pre-emption!

Date: 21 Jul 1993 14:36:42 -0700
From: haven.umd.edu!cs.umd.edu!mojo.eng.umd.edu!news.isi.com!news.isi.com!not-for-
mail@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Policy of Reverse Autopatches, anything new?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <morgdw.2.743277046@saturn.wwc.edu> morgdw@saturn.wwc.edu (DWIGHT
CLINTON MORGAN) writes:
>Have been off the net for awhile, has any new policies been released on
>reverse autopatches? Thanks.

Specifically, can one order pizza using a reverse autopatch? :-)

--

Jerry Gardner (jerry@isi.com) | "Violence is the last refuge of
Integrated Systems, Inc. | the incompetent" - Isaac Asimov

Date: Wed, 21 Jul 1993 17:58:45 GMT
From: swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!uwm.edu!linac!att!att!bigtop!longs!
n2ic@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: PRB-1 and the ARRL
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Despite assurances from my esteemed ARRL director, I see that the recent failures of PRB-1 were not an important topic at the recent ARRL Board of Directors meeting (see ARRL Bulletin 075, posted on rec.radio.amateur.misc).

If there was any discussion about PRB-1, it was obviously of lesser importance than life-threatening issues such as:

- The ARRL serving as administrator for club and military recreation call signs.
- The newly-created "ARRL Friendship Award"
- The publication of a "DXCC Yearbook"
- A lifetime amateur radio license (how will the FCC know when you die ?)
- Electronic filing of "Form 610"
- The Hiram Percy Maxim, Excellence in Recruiting, and Phil McGan Awards.

When are these Newington geniuses going to get their heads screwed on straight ?

Steve London, N2IC/0

Date: 21 Jul 93 22:56:51 GMT
From: psinntp!arrl.org@uunet.uu.net

Subject: PRB-1 and the ARRL
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In rec.radio.amateur.policy, n2ic@longs.att.com (Steve London) writes:

>Despite assurances from my esteemed ARRL director, I see that the recent
>failures of PRB-1 were not an important topic at the recent ARRL Board
>of Directors meeting (see ARRL Bulletin 075, posted on
>rec.radio.amateur.misc).

>

>If there was any discussion about PRB-1, it was obviously of lesser
>importance than life-threatening issues such as:

No exception taken to any of the discussion or the list.

>When are these Newington geniuses going to get their heads screwed on
 ^^^^^^^^^^

>straight ?

Please remember that the Board of Directors is NOT from Newington! One
of each is elected in each Division. The staff has no influence over
what is discussed at a Board meeting or its outcome.

>

>Steve London, N2IC/0

>

Ed Hare, KA1CV
American Radio Relay League
225 Main St.
Newington, CT 06111
(203) 666-1541 - voice
ARRL Laboratory Supervisor
RFI, xmtr and rcvr testing

ehare@arrl.org

"You will never put the puzzle together
if you keep putting all of the pieces
back in the box." Colleen

Date: 21 Jul 93 14:11:35 GMT
From: psinntp!arrl.org@uunet.uu.net
Subject: References for Code vs. No-Code Debate 82-90
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In rec.radio.amateur.policy, system@garlic.sbs.com (Tony Pelliccio) writes:

>Here are some of the ARRL and members of the ARRL's opinions that were
>published in QST ranging from September 1982 to September 1990.

Good job, Tony! I will keep a copy of this posting on file.

Here is my personal opinion, that may or may not represent official
League policy:

I must point out, though, that it seems to me that the list pretty much demonstrates that things were not quite as bad as you have been saying. Indeed, in the early 80s the ARRL followed the wishes of our members and opposed the no-code license. In the late 80s, we responded to a growing trend to support the no-code license, and ultimately supported a no-code license. I think that in this case our being slow to move on such a sensitive issue was correct; there was never a clear mandate one way or the other. It would be my finger-in-the wind guess that about 20+% of hams favored no-code, 20-% opposed it, and the other 60% really didn't care one way or the other, and were willing to let the issue be decided by those that did.

Please note that in the late 80s and early 90s we published a lot of pro and con discussions in our Correspondence column, and otherwise. I just can't see how, after looking at all of the open debate that we gave highly visible publicity, you can find strong fault with the processes used. Admittedly, we perhaps could have commissioned a survey (at time and financial costs), and allowed that survey to be part of the decision-making process, but would that have been much different than the informal surveys used by the Board? I remember getting a mail survey from our New England Division Director. I bet that most other Directors did the same.

If we ask for input, and seek that input from multiple sources (QST, mail surveys, in-person, etc.), can we not assume that we have heard from nearly everyone who wants to comment, or, as a minimum, have had a reasonable sample of everyone who wants to comment. IMNHO, that is even better than a random sample. After all, ARRL and the Directors have not been hiding behind a rock. It doesn't take a rocket scientist to figure out that we will indeed have some official response to nearly every burning issue affecting Amateur Radio. If anyone wants to influence that response, the doors have never been closed. I don't know if YOU did indeed try to influence your Director, but if you chose not to do so, I can not accept the angry response about the things you think we did wrong.

I will stand by my opinion that the process was not flawed. I also agree with the opinion that our final position was too conservative, and I am glad that the FCC did things the way they did. However, we have TWO mandates; represent the good of Amateur Radio, and represent the wishes

of our members. I guess (opinion only) that the reason for supporting no-code at all was based on the first; our reasons for selecting a conservative approach was probably based on the second.

Anyway, for the benefit of those who have had it with this thread, I will shut my big mouth now. :-). I didn't want to address this so much from the code-vs-no-code approach as I did to get on my soapbox a bit about the nature of the ARRL and the need to be part of the process. In this thread, much like in Wayne Green's editorials, I have seen too much mis-information offered as absolute fact. Unfortunately, just like with Mr. Green, the good and honest opinions that really need to be said get lost in the emotion and flippant tossing about of sheer poppycock. Just as I wish Mr. Green would stick to the issues instead of having to go off the deep end, I sure wish we could be a bit less emotional and address these concerns a bit more objectively. It really would be more effective, and the ARRL *NEEDS* most of its dissenters!

73 from ARRL HQ, Ed

>89APR 77 Correspondence

>No-Code License: The Pro, Bob Locher W9NKI et al

>And the Con... , Mike Kelly N4RXC et al

>I'm Against a Code-Free License, Dr. Paul A. Grayce K3LLH et al

>A Code-Free License: Ham Radio's Salvation, Ed Vosicky W0JT et al

>In Support of a Codeless VHF/UHF License, Jim DiTucci N2IXD et al

>A Codeless License is No Good, George A. Lucchi W6NVN et al

>Solutions..., Jeff Rahmel KA8ZAW et al

^^^^^^^^

At last! :-)

Ed Hare, KA1CV
American Radio Relay League
225 Main St.
Newington, CT 06111
(203) 666-1541 - voice
ARRL Laboratory Supervisor
RFI, xmtr and rcvr testing

ehare@arrl.org

"The goal of every engineer is to retire without getting blamed for a major catastrophe." -- Scott Adams and Dilbert

Date: Wed, 21 Jul 1993 13:55:23 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!noc.near.net!
saturn.caps.maine.edu!dartvax!Kenneth.E.Harker@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: STILL waiting for your license? Read this and weep!
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <22i5vt\$9k6@techbook.techbook.com>
genew@techbook.techbook.com (Gene Wolford) writes:

> I called the ARRL VE info number, 1-800-9ARRLVE.

I just called this number myself to find that my paperwork didn't leave ARRL hands until 18 days after I had taken my test. Needless to say, I am not impressed either! The VEC that gave me my test told me "oh, around eight to ten weeks..." What he should have said was "oh, eight to ten weeks after the ARRL wastes three weeks and \$5.60 of your money..."

And I was actually considering joining the ARRL myself, but now I don't think so. I would offer to pay more than \$5.60 for the handling, but I don't think that would help, really. I mean, my \$5.60 is enough money to pay a college intern to devote _an entire hour_ to my application alone. If it can't get double checked and forwarded on to the FCC within an hour, there's something really wrong with the ARRL. And somehow, I doubt my application received that much attention.

```
=====
      Ken Harker          "And there's bound to be rough waters
"Remember the Alamo! Remember And I know I'll take some falls
  Goliad!" - San Jacinto, 1836 But with the good Lord as my captain
Kenneth.E.Harker@Dartmouth.Edu I can make it through them all..."
      * Member of the EFF *          -Victoria Shaw, Garth Brooks
=====
```

Date: Wed, 21 Jul 1993 15:34:50 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!
europa.eng.gtefsd.com!darwin.sura.net!rsg1.er.usgs.gov!dgg.cr.usgs.gov!
bodoh@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: STILL waiting for your license? Read this and weep!
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <CAIpCC.MsL@dartvax.dartmouth.edu>, Kenneth.E.Harker@Dartmouth.Edu
(Kenneth E. Harker) writes:

|> In article <22i5vt\$9k6@techbook.techbook.com>
|> genew@techbook.techbook.com (Gene Wolford) writes:
|>


```

|> > I called the ARRL VE info number, 1-800-9ARRLVE.
|>
|> I just called this number myself to find that my paperwork didn't leave
|> ARRL hands until 18 days after I had taken my test. Needless to say, I
|> am not impressed either! The VEC that gave me my test told me "oh,
|> around eight to ten weeks..." What he should have said was "oh, eight
|> to ten weeks after the ARRL wastes three weeks and $5.60 of your
|> money..."
|>
|> And I was actually considering joining the ARRL myself, but now I don't
|> think so. I would offer to pay more than $5.60 for the handling, but I
|> don't think that would help, really. I mean, my $5.60 is enough money
|> to pay a college intern to devote _an entire hour_ to my application
|> alone. If it can't get double checked and forwarded on to the FCC
|> within an hour, there's something really wrong with the ARRL. And
|> somehow, I doubt my application received that much attention.
|>
|> =====
|> Ken Harker "And there's bound to be rough waters
--

```

I too am awaiting my license and would like to hear from the ARRL their side of this discussion... I am hoping to get one of the few remaining 1x3 calls in region 0. I am going to be extremely upset if I miss getting one of these calls and find out that the ARRL took that long. The VE told me that they mail it to the ARRL and then the ARRL processes it and Fedex's it to the FCC THE SAME DAY RECEIVED. If they are sitting on it for 18-20 days, why bother Fedexing - save the money and HIRE FASTER PEOPLE! Or at least tell the VE's the real story!

ARRL - what's the real scoop? Please answer here rather than email - it seems that inquiring minds want to know...

```

+++++
+ Tom Bodoh - Sr. systems software engineer, Hughes STX, N0X?? (in the mail) +
+ USGS/EROS Data Center, Sioux Falls, SD, USA 57198 (605) 594-6830 +
+ Internet; bodoh@dgg.cr.usgs.gov (152.61.192.66)
+
+ "Welcome back my friends to the show that never ends!" EL&P
+
+++++

```

Date: 21 Jul 1993 17:41:01 GMT
From: swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!math.ohio-state.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!
noc.near.net!news.bbn.com!bbn.com!levin@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: STILL waiting for your license? Read this and weep!

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <CAIpCC.MsL@dartvax.dartmouth.edu>, Kenneth.E.Harker@Dartmouth.Edu (Kenneth E. Harker) writes:

|> And I was actually considering joining the ARRL myself, but now I don't
|> think so. I would offer to pay more than \$5.60 for the handling, but I
|> don't think that would help, really. I mean, my \$5.60 is enough money
|> to pay a college intern to devote _an entire hour_ to my application
|> alone. If it can't get double checked and forwarded on to the FCC
|> within an hour, there's something really wrong with the ARRL.

I suppose you think the VEC is there to process just your application. Do you know how many they receive? I think they are probably quick enough in average times; but they are subject to peaks just like anyone else, and it's possible that when the mail brings in several large VE sessions' worth of applications at once it takes more than a little while to get through them.

I don't know if an hour per application is reasonable, either; there is a lot of careful checking and logging that goes on, and they go through every piece of paper that comes with each 610 and VE session; session logs and summary sheets, and for each 610 there are photocopies of existing licenses and CSCEs, the graded test sheets, and new CSCEs issued.

On the other hand I read the rules to mean that 610s should leave the VEC for the FCC within ten days of arrival at the VEC, regardless of how quick the VE team was.

/JBL KD10N

=

Nets: levin@bbn.com |
pots: (617)873-3463 |
KD10N (@KB4N.NH.USA) |

"I gotta go."

-- I. Shoales

Date: 21 Jul 93 20:04:28 GMT

From: ogicse!uwm.edu!cs.utexas.edu!usc!nic.csu.net!eis.CalState.EDU!

jherndo@network.ucsd.edu

Subject: STILL waiting for your license? Read this and weep!

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

I haven't looked into the "allowed length of time" that the VE and ARRL can hold the application. If it is 10 days per section, then I can't see any excuse for the ARRL holding on to the application for over 10 days.

Also, while I'm getting my 560 cents worth in, they should have a sorter

that sorts between NEW licenses vs. upgrades. Those who are upgrading can use a temporary call on the air, while those who are new hams are "back quiet" for 2-3 months. NEW licenses should get priority to help push them through the system.

But as I rot for the next few weeks (working on number 5 now) I learn as much as I can about antennas, equipment, t-hunting, and ham etiquette.

[> John W. Herndon - INTERNET: jherndo@eis.calstate.edu <]

Date: 21 Jul 93 15:23:40 GMT
From: ogicse!uwm.edu!msuinfo!uchinews!hayward@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jul16.161147.27822@rsg1.er.usgs.gov>,
<POPOVICH.93Jul16133503@cyclades.ma30.bull.com>,
<1993Jul19.190838.5804@TorreyPinesCA.ncr.com>
Subject : Re: Call sign snobbery

In article <1993Jul19.190838.5804@TorreyPinesCA.ncr.com>
kevin@TorreyPinesCA.ncr.com
(Kevin Sanders) writes:

:Talk about embarrassing phonetics, my call (about 8 months old now) is
:KN6FQ. You don't even need phonetics to make that one sound obscene
:over the air! I wouldn't trade it for anything.
:

Kevin, send in a form 610 form requesting a new call sign, attach a
copy of your license and the simple statement that you find the
one assigned to you to cause you embarrassment. It works.

Kristin Rachael Hayward

--

Kristin Rachael Hayward University of Maine WX9T
kristin@gandalf.umcs.maine.edu (yes, I know I didn't post from there)

Date: Wed, 21 Jul 1993 13:03:26 GMT

From: cs.utexas.edu!asuvax!ukma!rsg1.er.usgs.gov!dgg.cr.usgs.gov!
bodoh@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <22g212\$6b8@access.digex.net>, <CAHtpr.5Fu@feenix.metronet.com>,
<1993Jul21.051207.11928@en.ecn.purdue.edu>
Subject : Re: Order pizza on your autopatch now

In article <1993Jul21.051207.11928@en.ecn.purdue.edu>, n9ljx@en.ecn.purdue.edu
(Scott A Stambaugh) writes:
|> In article <CAHtpr.5Fu@feenix.metronet.com> marcbg@feenix.metronet.com (Marc
Grant) writes:
|> >
|> >Okay - can you order ham sandwiches?
|>
|> "OK Sir - 2 Ham sandwiches. Would you like Code or NoCode with that?"

EXTRA code of course!

|>
|> --sas
|> --
|> Scott Stambaugh - N9LJX internet: n9ljx@ecn.purdue.edu

--
+++++
+ Tom Bodoh - Sr. systems software engineer, Hughes STX, NOX?? (in the mail) +
+ USGS/EROS Data Center, Sioux Falls, SD, USA 57198 (605) 594-6830 +
+ Internet; bodoh@dgg.cr.usgs.gov (152.61.192.66)
+
+ "Welcome back my friends to the show that never ends!" EL&P
+
+++++

Date: Wed, 21 Jul 93 15:30:04 GMT
From: vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!ux1.cso.uiuc.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!
europa.eng.gtefsd.com!darwin.sura.net!news-feed-1.peachnet.edu!umn.edu!csus.edu!
netcom.com!netcomsv!orchard.la.@sdd.hp.com
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <930713.015754.5P2.rusnews.w165w@garlic.sbs.com>,
<16JUL199308062528@nssdca.gsfc.nasa.gov>, <CAHCHC.C71@news.Hawaii.Edu>ra.net
Subject : Re: Give a VE \$5.60, walk

In article <CAHCHC.C71@news.Hawaii.Edu> jherman@uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu (Jeff
Herman) writes:

>In article <16JUL199308062528@nssdca.gsfc.nasa.gov> stocker@nssdca.gsfc.nasa.gov
(ERICH FRANZ STOCKER) writes:

>>society. The morse fanatics are akin to the groups in society that
>>discriminate against others on some one issue (e.g. race, relation,
>>country of origin, etc).

>>

>>Erich

>>N30XM

>>>

>

>Erich,

> We cannot change our race or country of origin; but our skill in copying
>code is something which we DO have control over. Thus, your statement
>comparing morse enthusiasts to bigots is ridiculous.

While it is true many people can learn CW, much like many people can
learn to play the piano, Erich does have a valid point. It appears
that people who do not know CW are viewed as lesser people by the
morse fanatics. It is effectively a prejudice. It would seem that
"morse fanatics" automatically assume that a person that doesn't
know Morse code is lazy or wants something for free.

You may not feel this way, but this is an attitude I've frequently
seen among the people I regard as "morse fanatics". This attitude is
not friendly, and effectively is the same as a racial or ethnic bigotry.

--

* Dana H. Myers KK6JQ | Views expressed here are *
* (310) 337-5136 | mine and do not necessarily *
* dana@locus.com DoD #466 | reflect those of my employer
*
* This Extra supports the abolition of the 13 and 20 WPM tests *

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #245
